

II. **REMARKS**

Please enter the amendment and reconsider the application in view of the amendment and the remarks set forth below. It is believed that no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action on page 2, claims 19, 134-136 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

In the Office Action on page 4, claims 1-26, 28-58, 60-90, 92-108, 110-122, and 124-137 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner contends that these claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended. Applicant has amended claim 1 to add a missing period, amended the "enabling" language, and "opportunity" language. Applicant appreciates the cited Microsoft Computer Dictionary finding, and the subsequent suggestion to mention a "processor". Claims 5 and 129 have also been amended. The "if" does not render claim 129 indefinite: either the website facilitates sending the gift or if the gift is refused, etc.

In the Office Action on page 7, claims 1-18, 33-50, 62-82, 94-108, 110-114, 126-128, and 129-133 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner contends that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The rejections are respectfully traversed but moot in view of the amendments herein.

In the Office Action on page 9, claims 19-21, 25, 28-29, 51-53, 57, 60-61, 83-85,

89, 92-93, 115-122, 124-125, 129-136 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner contends these claims as being unpatentable over Bezos et al. (US2002/0178089) in view of Micali (US 5,812,670) and further in view of MacNaughton et al. (US 5,796,393).

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

In the Office Action on page 18, claims 1-14, 16, 22-24, 26, 30-46, 48, 54-56, 58, 62-78, 80, 86-88, 90, 94-108, 110, 112, and 126-128 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner contends these claims as being unpatentable over Bezos et al in view of Micali further in view of MacNaughton and further in view of Kobata et al. (US 7,051,003 81).

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

In the Office Action on page 31, claims 15, 47, 79, and 111 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner contends these claims as obvious over Bezos in view of Micali further in view of MacNaughton further in view of Kobata and further in view of Walker (US 6,330,544).

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

In the Office Action on page 32, claims 17, 18, 49, 50, 81, 82, 113, and 114 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner contends these claims as obvious over Bezos in view of Micali further in view of MacNaughton further in view of Kobata and further in view of Oneda (US 5,965,860).

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

In the Office Action on page 33, claim 137 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a). The Examiner contends this claim as being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Micali further in view of MacNaughton and further in view of Douglas et al. (US 6,039,688).

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set out in Applicant's filing of July 5, 2010, though the claims have been amended.

III. CONCLUSION

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set out below if it can in any way expedite or facilitate issuance of a patent on the application. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Although the present communication includes amendments to the claims, and/or characterizations of referenced art, the Applicant is not conceding in this application that the original claims are not patentable over the cited prior art references. Rather, any amendments or characterizations are being made to facilitate the expedited prosecution of this application. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure. Accordingly, reviewers of this prosecution history, or that of any related child application, shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

With respect to the present application, the Applicant hereby rescinds any disclaimer of claim scope made in the parent application or any predecessor or related application. The Examiner is advised that any previous disclaimer, if any, and the prior art that it was made to avoid, may need to be revisited. Nor should a disclaimer, if any, in the present application be read back into any predecessor or related application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 1, 2012

Peter K. Trzyna
(Reg. No. 32,601)
(Customer No. 28710)

P.O. Box 7131
Chicago, IL 60680-7131
(312) 240-0824